

Dr. Boesen

Attorney Docket No. P03999US8

REMARKS**Overview**

Claims 1-21 have been rejected. The present response is an earnest effort to place all claims in proper form for immediate allowance.

Issues Regarding Specification

The Examiner has objected to the Specification for failure to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter (Office Action, page 2). In particular, the Examiner believes that there is not proper antecedent basis for claim 19 which recites "a transmitter . . . for simultaneously transmitting" in line 11 (Office Action, page 2). The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the Applicant points out that the application specifically discloses that the air conduction sensor 30 and the bone conduction sensor 24 are operatively connected to a stereo transceiver or separate transceivers. Therefore, the application provides clear support for simultaneous sending and receiving which satisfies MPEP § 608.01(o). The Examiner is directed towards page 5, last four lines through page 6, line 7 which state

" . . . [T]he air conduction sensor 30 and the bone conduction sensor 24 are in operative connection with a transceiver 52. Although a single stereo transceiver is shown, the present invention also contemplates that multiple transceivers could be used to transmit the air conduction signal and the bone conduction signal on separate channels. The present invention also contemplates that the air conduction sensor and the bone conduction sensor signals can be combined and any a number of ways so that they may be transmitted from a single transceiver and then received and separated."

Therefore, the Specification clearly discloses simultaneously transmitting. Therefore, this objection must be withdrawn.

Dr. Boesen

Attorney Docket No. P03999US8

Issue Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a ways as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner references the limitation of "simultaneously transmitting" in line 11 of claim 19 (Office Action, page 2).

For the reasons previously expressed, this subject matter is described in the Specification in a manner that reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession. There is no requirement of *in haec verbal* support. *All Dental Prodx, LLC v. Advantage Dental Products, Inc.*, 309 F.3d 774 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,783 to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,305 to Bauman.

Bauman is directed towards an open ear auditory pathway stimulator to manage tinnitus and hyperacusis (Abstract). In Bauman, a structure is disclosed that places a portion of the housing of the device against the posterior superior wall and allows an unobstructed air pathway along the posterior inferior wall (Figure 1). The purpose of this position is so that Bauman can emit sound waves from a receiver aimed at the superior portion of the tympanic membrane while avoiding wax build-up and an occlusive effect (col. 6, lines 22 to 46).

The Examiner states that "it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the housing structure in Figure 1 or Figure 4 of Bauman for the housing structure in Figure 1 of Anderson, thereby allow ambient sound into the external

Dr. Boesen

Attorney Docket No. P03999US8

auditory canal and to avoid the occlusion effect" citing Bauman, col. 6, lines 31-36. (Office Action, page 3, last three lines through page 4, line 3). The Examiner does not make a *prima facie* case of unpatentability because there is no motivation or suggestion to combine from either reference.

In Bauman, the device is pressed against the posterior superior wall to aim the receiver at the tympanic membranes (col. 6, lines 43-46). Bauman does not disclose any type of bone sensing, and is directed towards a very different type of problem.

Further, "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the combination." MPEP § 2143.01 citing In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680; 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anderson does not indicate any particular desirability for nonocclusivity. Bauman disclose nonocclusivity, but is not directed to an earpiece or sensing bone conduction signals. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 2, there is an independent reason for patentability. In particular, neither Anderson nor Bauman disclose a bone conduction sensor "fitted to the contours of a posterior superior wall of the external auditory canal." Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn on that basis as well.

Claims 12-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,721,783 to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,305 to Bauman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,059 to Kruger. It is respectfully submitted that these rejections should also be withdrawn. The differences of the Anderson and Bauman references have already been discussed. Neither teaches a nonocclusive earpiece with a bone conduction sensor. The Examiner does not indicate proper motivation or suggestion to combine and

Dr. Boesen

Attorney Docket No. P03999US8

therefore fails to make a *prime facie* case. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections should also be withdrawn for that independent reason.

Conclusion

This is a request under the provision of 37 CFR § 1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a response in the above-identified application for one month from October 23, 2003 to November, 2003. Applicant is a small entity; therefore, please charge Deposit Account number 26-0084 in the amount of \$55.00 for one month to cover the cost of the extension. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged or credited to Deposit Account 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY D. HARTY, Reg. No. 40,639
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No. (515) 288-3667
Fax No. (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 27139

Attorneys of Record

JDG/bja